Page 7

## **REMARKS**

In this paper, claims 1, 13 and 14 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1, 3-14, 16, and 18-20 are pending, and claims 2, 15 and 17 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 3-14, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to clarify that the radially inwardly extending spline is in the form of a projection and that the radially outwardly extending spline is in the form of a slot. Both claims recite how the radially outwardly extending spline (slot) is disposed circumferentially adjacent to the radially inwardly extending spline (projection), so it is believed that the claims clearly recite the intended structures. The specification has been amended to clarify that reference number (516) designates projections and that reference number (518) designates slots so that the new claim terms have proper antecedent basis.

Claims 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Militana (US 3,168,836). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Militana discloses a sprocket (20) comprising a core (22) and a wear rim (24). Core (22) includes a hub (26) with an opening (28) that fits on the end of a vehicle drive shaft. A plurality of spider arms (30) extend radially outwardly from hub (26), and a hoop (32) is disposed on the ends of spider arms (30). Wear rim (24) has an inner periphery (33) that is dimensioned to fit on the outer periphery of hoop (32) with a sliding fit so that wear rim (24) may be removed and replaced easily from core (22).

The office action interpreted spider arms (30) to be the root portions of radially inwardly extending splines. However, claim 13 has been amended to clarify that the root portion of the radially inwardly extending spline (projection) originates from and extends radially inwardly from an innermost peripheral surface of the sprocket body that forms an adjacent radially outwardly extending spline (slot). Clearly, Militana's spider arms (30) do not originate from and extend radially inwardly from an innermost peripheral surface of the sprocket body that forms adjacent radially

TAKAHIRO NAKANO, et al Application No.: 10/711,326

Page 8

outwardly extending splines at (28). Thus, Militana neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter recited in claim 13.

Claims 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kamada, et al (US 2004/0142783). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kamada, et al discloses a bicycle sprocket (200) having lateral projections or splines (224). According to the representation of Kamada, et al's Fig. 3(B) at page 4 of the office action, element (A) is a radially inwardly extending spline, and element (C) is a radially outwardly extending spline. The root portion of radially inwardly extending spline (A) is designated by element (H), and the radially inner portion of radially inwardly extending spline (A) is designated by element (J). The office action interpreted the side walls of the root portion of radially inwardly extending spline (A) to be surfaces (N) and (P). However, surfaces (N) and (P) face axially and do not face in a direction of operating rotation of the sprocket body as recited in claim 13. Furthermore, the root portion (H) of the radially inwardly extending spline (A) is disposed *above* radially outwardly extending spline (C) an therefore does not originate from and extend radially inwardly from an innermost peripheral surface of the sprocket body that forms the adjacent radially outwardly extending spline (C). Thus, Kamada, et al neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §112 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Deland Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE P.O. Box 69 Klamath River, California 96050 (530) 465-2430